



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

in  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,743	04/19/2001	Gerald Deboy	GR 99 P 2591 P	9326

7590                    01/09/2003

LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MONDT, JOHANNES P

[REDACTED] ART UNIT      [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/838,743	DEBOY ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Johannes P Mondt	2826

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 December 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-11.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

~~NATHAN J. FLYNN~~  
~~SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER~~  
~~TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800~~

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Although the proposed after-final amendment is a serious attempt to quantify the numerical limitation that previously formed the substance of the original claim 2, - as part of the first amended claim 1 of Paper No. 8 (Amendment B), charge quantity and surface charge density are still confused, not only in the specification, but also in the claim language. To wit, the "charge quantity Q" (line 4-5 from below in newly amended claim 1) is NOT and cannot be a charge quantity, but instead must be a surface charge density, if a possible value of Q is  $Q_c$ , because  $Q_c$  is a surface charge density, necessarily so in view of Inequality (2) of the specification, also featuring in said newly amended claim 1. As for the terminology "surface charge" also and inconsistently used in said newly amended claim 1, Applicant is reminded of the difference between charge, either surface or volume, on the one hand, and charge density on the other hand. Lack of distinction between charge and charge density, as well as the simultaneous expression of  $Q_c$  in terms of number of charge carriers per unit surface area and in terms of "As" (probably Ampere times second, which is to be more conventionally denoted as C for Coulomb). The specification itself suffers from the same deficiency even in its presently proposed amended form.